

REMARKS

The Official Action of September 19, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1 and 3-5, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 2 has been cancelled. Claims 1 and 3-5 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's objections to the claims, drawings and specification, and rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has amended the claims and specification (including the abstract) to eliminate each of the problems identified by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the specification made correction of the drawings unnecessary.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection to the claims, drawings and specification and rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, have now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Viertel in view of Mukai and Iwanami. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to the claims as amended.

Viertel discloses a recyclable visor made of polypropylene, but does not disclose a cover. Moreover, in column 1, line 52 the document quotes:

"Another **object** of the present invention is to offer the advantage that it becomes possible to **omit** the otherwise customary **covering** of the sun visor body with a decor material"

When examining obviousness the motivation to modify the prior art **must flow** from some teaching in the art that suggest the desirability or incentive to make the modifications needed to arrive at the claimed invention. Not only is this requirement not met in Viertel where the teaching is how to insert a mirror in a sun visor, but the document specifically states that the advantage of it is to avoid a cover. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Viertel **teaches away** from the claimed sun visor with a cover.

None of the other prior art documents disclose a cover and a central frame both in thermoplastic material and being both integrated by an injection phase. The claimed visor has many advantages, as is stated in the description, like a perfect coating of the cover without any gap between it and the frame, the possibility to introduce both components in the same manufacturing process, reducing enormously the final costs and the times of manufacturing the pieces.

Linked to the previous reasons are the matters that the teaching of document Viertel is to include a hollow blow molded sun visor body and the teaching of document Mukai is how to introduce refrigeration channels into a mould at a sandwich injection process in order to obtain different surfaces of moulded materials. Being both teachings different from the aim of the claimed application and even using different manufacturing processes.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\bn\u\udap\mimbielal\pto\2007-01-19 Amendment-A.doc